

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gorsuch in view of Shaheen. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As properly stated by the Examiner, Gorsuch does not specifically teach a common channel description. Instead, the Examiner cites Shaheen as discloses a common channel description transmitted to a subscriber station (abstract and col. 9, lines 27-42 and col. 10, lines 12-18). Applicant's respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statements.

Shaheen discloses channels that are allocated/deallocated and perhaps synchronized. However, there is no description of a common channel. Even assuming *arguendo* that a common channel is disclosed, it clearly does not disclose the order (i.e. sequence) of data transmission for one direction, as claimed in the present invention. Specifically, Shaheen discloses a system supporting a packet channel alterable between a packet control channel configuration and a packet traffic channel configuration. In the packet control channel configuration, the packet channel may provide only control functions or a combination of control and traffic functions. Alternatively, the packet channel may be configured in a packet traffic configuration so that the packet channel provides only packet traffic functions. In this configuration, another packet channel must be configured in the packet control channel configuration to provide control functions for the packet traffic only packet channel. The claimed invention, on the other hand, allows data for different services to be transmitted simultaneously, with a physical channel being assigned to each service and one of the channel resources being unambiguously assigned to each channel with the channel description.

Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed by the applied prior art, claims 1 and 8 are patentable. Claims 2-5 and 7, depending therefrom, are similarly patentable.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gorsuch in view of Shaheen and Kolev. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the

arguments above, and since Kolev fails to disclose a common channel provided the order of data transmission.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.449122010700. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762